

February 9, 2010

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 9, 2010

A Regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hopewell, Virginia, was held Tuesday, February 9, 2010, at 6:30 PM in the City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 300 North Main Street, Hopewell, Virginia.

PRESENT: Brenda S. Pelham, Mayor
N. Gregory Cuffey, Vice Mayor
Christina J. Luman-Bailey, Councilor
Curtis W. Harris, Councilor
Kenneth B. Emerson, Councilor
Gerald S. Stokes, Councilor
K. Wayne Walton, Councilor

Edwin C. Daley, City Manager
Thomas E. Lacheney, City Attorney
Ann M. Romano, City Clerk

Mayor Pelham was detained and Vice Mayor Cuffey opened the meeting at 6:34 PM. Roll call was taken as follows:

Mayor Pelham	-	ABSENT (arrived at 7:15 PM)
Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	present
Councilor Bailey	-	present
Councilor Harris	-	present
Councilor Emerson	-	present
Councilor Stokes	-	present
Councilor Walton	-	present

CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilor Stokes, and seconded by Councilor Bailey, to convene into Closed Session to discuss Legal Matters, Economic Development, Personnel; and, Boards & Commissions, in accordance with Virginia Code Sec. 2.2-3711 (A)(1) (3) and (7). Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes

OPEN SESSION

At 7:30 PM Council convened into Open Session. Councilors responded to the question: "Were the only matters discussed in the Closed Meeting public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements; and public business matters identified in the motion to convene into Closed Session?" Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Mayor Pelham	-	yes
Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes

February 9, 2010

Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes

REGULAR MEETING

Mayor Pelham opened the regular meeting at 7:30 PM. Roll call was taken as follows:

Mayor Pelham	-	yes
Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes

Prayer was offered by Vice Mayor Cuffey, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilor Harris, and seconded by Councilor Walton to approve the Consent Agenda: Minutes: City Council Regular Meeting January 12, 2010; and Work Session January 26, 2010; Pending List; Information for Council Review: Recreation Commission agenda 1/13/10 & minutes 12/9/09; HRHA agenda 1/11/10 & minutes of 10/19/09; School Board agenda 1/14/10; TSB minutes 12/1/09; ARLS minutes 1/19/10; HRWTF agenda 1/25/10; HDSS Advisory Board Annual report 2009; Personnel Change Report; Public Hearings Announcements: none; Routine Approval of Work Sessions: February 23, 2010 – 6:30 PM; Ordinances on second and final reading: Ord. No. 2010-01 – PPEA; Routine Grant Approval: None; Proclamations/Resolutions/Presentations: None. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

ORDINANCE NO. 2010-01

An Ordinance amending Ordinance 2009-10 adopting, enacting and implementing local guidelines pursuant to the Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002, as amended, for the City of Hopewell, Virginia.

WHEREAS, the Virginia General Assembly, pursuant to the Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002, Va. Code § 56-575.1 et seq., and all amendments thereto (PPEA), has determined that there is a public need for timely acquisition, design, construction, improvement, renovation, expansion, equipping, maintenance, operation, implementation, or installation of education facilities, technology infrastructure and other public

February 9, 2010

infrastructure and government facilities within the Commonwealth that serve a public need and purpose; and

WHEREAS, such public need may not be wholly satisfied by existing methods of procurement in which qualifying projects are acquired, designed, constructed, improved, renovated, expanded, equipped, maintained, operated, implemented, or installed; and

WHEREAS, there are inadequate resources to develop new education facilities, technology infrastructure and other public infrastructure and government facilities for the benefit of citizens of the Commonwealth, and there is demonstrated evidence that public-private partnerships can meet these needs by improving the schedule for delivery, lowering the cost, and providing other benefits to the public; and

WHEREAS, financial incentives exist under state and federal tax provisions that promote public entities to enter into partnerships with private entities to develop qualifying projects; and

WHEREAS, authorizing private entities to develop or operate one or more qualifying projects may result in the availability of such projects to the public in a more timely or less costly fashion, thereby serving the public safety, benefit, and welfare; and

WHEREAS, the intent of the PPEA has been declared to, among other things, encourage investment in the Commonwealth by private entities and facilitate the bond financing provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 or other similar financing mechanisms, private capital and other funding sources that support the development or operation of qualifying projects, to the end that financing for qualifying projects be expanded and accelerated to improve and add to the convenience of the public, and such that public and private entities may have the greatest possible flexibility in contracting with each other for the provision of the public services that are the subject of the PPEA; and

WHEREAS, prior to requesting or considering a proposal for a qualifying project under the PPEA, the City must adopt and make publically available guidelines that are sufficient to enable the City to comply with the PPEA, which guidelines shall be reasonable, encourage competition, and guide the selection of projects under the purview of the City; and

WHEREAS, the following guidelines fulfill the purposes of, and meet the requirements of, the PPEA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HOPEWELL that the following guidelines are hereby adopted, enacted and implemented pursuant to the PPEA:

February 9, 2010

City of Hopewell, Virginia

**Guidelines for the Implementation of the Public-Private Education Facilities and
Infrastructure Act of 2002**

**Adopted April 8, 2008, and
Amended February 9, 2010**

**City of Hopewell, Virginia
Guidelines for the Implementation of the
Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	p. 1
II.	General Provisions.....	p.2
	A. Proposal Submission.....	p. 3
	B. Proposal Review Fees.....	p. 3
	C. Reservation of Rights.....	p. 4
	D. Virginia Freedom of Information Act.....	p. 6
	E. Use of Public Funds.....	p.6
	F. Applicability of Other Laws.....	p.6
III.	Solicited Proposals.....	p.6
IV.	Unsolicited Proposals.....	p.6
	A. Decision to Accept and Consider Unsolicited Proposal; Notice.....	p.6
	B. Posting Requirements.....	p.7
	C. Review at Conceptual Stage.....	p.8
V.	Proposal Preparation and Submission.....	p.9
	A. Format for Submissions at Conceptual Stage.....	p.9
	B. Format for Submissions at Detailed Stage.....	p.12
VI.	Proposal Evaluation and Selection Criteria.....	p.14
	A. Qualifications and Experience.....	p.14
	B. Project Characteristics.....	p.15
	C. Project Financing.....	p.15
	D. Project Benefit and Compatibility.....	p.16
	E. Other Factors.....	p.16
VII.	Interim and Comprehensive Agreements.....	p.16
	A. Interim Agreement Terms.....	p.17
	B. Comprehensive Agreement Terms.....	p.17
	C. Notice and Posting Requirements.....	p.19
VIII.	Governing Provisions.....	p.20
	Terms and Definitions.....	p.20

I. Introduction

The Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002 (the "PPEA") grants the City of Hopewell (the "City"), a responsible public entity as defined in the PPEA, the authority to enter into public-private partnership agreements for the development of a wide range of projects for public use if the City determines that there is a public need for the project and that private involvement may provide the project to the public in a timely or cost-effective fashion. For the purposes of these guidelines, the term "City" includes its School Board in the case of education facilities. Individually negotiated interim and comprehensive agreements between a private entity, as defined in the PPEA, and the City will define the respective rights and obligations of the City and the private entity. Although guidance with regard to the application of the PPEA is provided herein, it will be incumbent upon the City and all private entities to comply with the provisions of the PPEA.

In order for a project to come under the PPEA, it must meet the definition of a "qualifying project." The City may consider utilizing PPEA procedures if:

1. There is a public need for or benefit derived from the qualifying project of the type the private entity proposes;
2. The estimated cost of the project is reasonable in relation to similar facilities; and
3. The private entity's plans will result in the timely development or operation of the project.

The PPEA contains a broad definition of qualifying projects that include public buildings and facilities of all types, for example:

1. An education facility, including, but not limited to, a school building (including any stadium or other facility primarily used for school events), any functionally related and subordinate facility and land to a school building and any depreciable property provided for use in a school facility that is operated as part of the public school system or as an institution of higher education;
2. A building or facility that meets a public purpose and is developed or operated by or for any public entity;
3. Improvements, together with equipment, necessary to enhance public safety and security of buildings to be principally used by a public entity;
4. Utility and telecommunications and other communications infrastructure;
5. A recreational facility;
6. Technology infrastructure and services, including but not limited to telecommunications, automated data processing, word processing and management information systems, and related information, equipment, goods and services;
7. Technology, equipment, or infrastructure designed to deploy wireless broadband services to schools, businesses, or residential areas, or
8. Any improvements necessary or desirable to any unimproved locally- or state-owned real estate.

The PPEA establishes requirements to which the City must adhere when reviewing and approving proposals received pursuant to the PPEA. In addition, the PPEA specifies the criteria that must be used to select a proposal and the contents of the interim or comprehensive agreement detailing the relationship between the City and the private entity.

The Hopewell City Council (the "City Council") adopted these guidelines on April 8, 2008 to implement the PPEA in the City. The City Manager will follow these guidelines in receiving and evaluating any proposal submitted to the City under the provisions of the PPEA. The City Council must adopt any amendments to these guidelines.

These guidelines shall govern all City PPEA projects, including education facilities, and shall be applicable to all City agencies, boards, commissions, and committees. The City Manager may designate a working group (the "Working Group") to assist the City Manager in evaluating proposals and negotiating any interim or comprehensive agreement. The City Manager shall implement these guidelines, receive proposals submitted under the PPEA, and respond to inquiries regarding the PPEA or these guidelines, but the City Manager may specifically designate one or more persons to perform one or more of these duties.

II. General Provisions

A. Proposal Submission

A proposal may be either solicited by the City or delivered by a private entity on an unsolicited basis. In either case, the proposal shall be clearly identified as a "PPEA PROPOSAL." To be considered, one original and eight (8) copies of any unsolicited proposal must be submitted along with the applicable fee to the City Manager, or his designee as set forth above, 300 N. Main Street, Hopewell, Virginia 23860 by certified mail, express delivery or hand delivery. Proposers may be required to follow a two-part proposal submission process consisting of an initial conceptual phase and a detailed phase, as described herein. The City may discontinue its evaluation of any proposal at any time during the conceptual or detailed phase.

The PPEA allows private entities to include innovative financing methods, including the imposition of user fees or service payments, in a proposal. Such financing arrangements may include the issuance of debt instruments, equity or other securities or obligations. Proposals may include, if applicable, the portion of the tax-exempt private activity bond limitation amount to be allocated annually to the Commonwealth of Virginia pursuant to the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 for the development of education facilities using public-private partnerships, and to provide for carryovers of any unused limitation amount.

Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a concise description of the proposer's capabilities to complete the proposed qualifying project and the benefits to be derived from the project by the City. Project benefits to be considered are those occurring during the construction, renovation, expansion or improvement phase and during the life cycle of the project. Proposals also should include a scope of work and a financial plan for the project, containing enough detail to allow an analysis by the City of the financial feasibility of the proposed project. Any facility, building, infrastructure, or improvement included in a proposal shall be identified specifically or conceptually. The cost analysis of a proposal should not be linked solely to any proposed financing plan, as the City may determine to finance the project through other available means. The City Manager or his designee may request, in writing, clarification of the submission.

The PPEA is intended to encourage proposals from the private sector that offer the provision of private financing in support of the proposed public project and the assumption of commensurate risk by the private operator, but also benefits to the private entity through innovative approaches to project financing, development and use. However, while substantial private sector involvement is encouraged, qualifying facilities will still be devoted primarily to public use and typically involve facilities critical to the public health, safety and welfare. Accordingly, the City shall continue to exercise full and proper due diligence in the evaluation and selection of private entities for these projects. Prospective private entities proposing projects shall be held strictly accountable for their representations or other information provided regarding their qualifications, experience, or other contents of their proposals, including all specific aspects of proposed plans to be performed by the private entity.

B. Proposal Review Fees

February 9, 2010

The PPEA authorizes the City to charge fees to cover the costs of processing, reviewing, and evaluating proposals.

1. A fee in accordance with the fee schedule below, paid with certified funds, shall accompany any initial proposal to cover the cost of determining whether it is a qualifying project with a reasonable expectation of satisfying the criteria of Va. Code § 56-575.4 (C) of the PPEA of public need or benefit, reasonable estimated cost, and timely acquisition of the project. The fee shall be based on the total cost of the proposal.
2. If the proposal is advanced to the detailed stage of review, an additional fee in accordance with the fee schedule below shall be due. The fee, paid in certified funds, shall accompany the proposer's submission at the detailed stage.

Review Stage	Fee	Minimum	Maximum
Conceptual/Initial	1%	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
Detail	1%	\$5,000.00	\$50,000.00

C. Reservation of Rights

In connection with any proposal or qualifying project, the City shall have all rights available to it by law in administering these guidelines, including without limitation, the right in its sole and unfettered discretion to:

1. Reject any or all proposals at any time, for any reason, solely within the discretion of the City. Proposers shall have no recourse against the City for such rejection. Proposers will be notified in writing of such rejection in accordance with these guidelines.
2. Terminate evaluation of any and all proposals at any time.
3. Suspend, discontinue or terminate interim and comprehensive agreement negotiations with any proposer at any time before the actual authorized execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement by all parties.
4. Negotiate with a proposer without being bound by any provision in its proposal.
5. Request or obtain additional information about any proposal.
6. Issue addenda to or cancel any request for proposals ("RFP") or invitation for bids ("IFB").
7. Revise, supplement or withdraw all or any part of these guidelines at any time and from time to time.
8. Modify any standard fee schedule as stated herein for a specific proposal or for all future proposals.
9. Decline to return any and all fees required to be paid by proposers hereunder.
10. Request revisions to conceptual or detailed proposals.
11. Submit a proposal for review by outside consultants or advisors selected by the City without notice to the proposer. Such consultants or advisors shall be advised of, and required to maintain, the confidentiality of information that has been designated as confidential, and to refer all requests for such information to the City.

Under no circumstances shall the City be liable for, or reimburse, the costs incurred by proposers, whether or not selected for negotiations, in developing proposals or in negotiating agreements. Any and all information the City makes available to proposers shall be as a convenience to the proposer and without representation or

warranty of any kind. Proposers may not rely upon any oral responses to inquiries. If a proposer has a question regarding application of these guidelines, the proposer must submit the question in writing and the City will respond in writing as it determines appropriate.

D. Virginia Freedom of Information Act

1. General applicability of disclosure provisions

Proposal documents submitted by private entities are generally subject to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") except that Va. Code § 2.2-3705.6 (11) exempts certain documents from public disclosure. FOIA exemptions, however, are discretionary, and the City may elect to release some or all of documents except to the extent the documents are:

- a. Trade secrets of the private entity as defined in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (Va. Code § 59.1-336 et seq.);
- b. Financial records of the private entity that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or otherwise, including but not limited to, balance sheets and financial statements; or
- c. Other information submitted by a private entity, where if the record or document were made public prior to the execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement the financial interest or bargaining position of the public or private entity would be adversely affected.

Additionally, to the extent access to proposal documents submitted by private entities are compelled or protected from disclosure by a court order, the City will comply with the provisions of such order.

2. Protection from mandatory disclosure for certain documents submitted by a private entity

Before a document of a private entity may be withheld from disclosure, the private entity must make a written request to the City at the time the documents are submitted, designating with specificity the documents for which the protection is being sought and a clear statement of the reasons for invoking the protection with reference to one or more of three classes of records listed in Section I.D.1.

Upon the receipt of a written request for protection of documents, the City shall determine whether the documents contain (i) trade secrets, (ii) financial records, or (iii) other information that would adversely affect the financial interest or bargaining position of the City or private entity in accordance with Section I.D.1. The City will make a written determination of the nature and scope of the protection to be afforded by the City under this subdivision. If the written determination provides less protection than requested by the private entity, the private entity will be accorded an opportunity to withdraw its proposal. Nothing shall prohibit further negotiations of the documents to be accorded protection from release although what may be protected must be limited to the categories of records identified in Section I.D.1.

Once a written determination has been made by the City, the documents afforded protection under this subdivision shall continue to be protected from disclosure when in the possession of the City or any affected jurisdiction to which such documents are provided.

If a private entity fails to designate trade secrets, financial records, or other confidential or proprietary information for protection from disclosure, such information, records or documents shall be subject to disclosure under FOIA.

3. Protection from mandatory disclosure for certain documents produced by the City

The City may withhold from disclosure memoranda, staff evaluations, or other records prepared by the City, its staff, outside advisors, or consultants exclusively for the evaluation and negotiation of proposals where (i) if such records were made public prior to or after the execution of an interim or a comprehensive agreement, the financial interest or bargaining position of the City would be adversely affected, and (ii) the basis for the determination required in clause (i) is documented in writing by the City.

Cost estimates relating to a proposed procurement transaction prepared by or for the City shall not be open to public inspection.

4. The City may not withhold from public access:

- a. Procurement records other than those subject to the written determination of the City;
- b. Information concerning the terms and conditions of any interim or comprehensive agreement, service contract, lease, partnership, or any agreement of any kind entered into by the City and the private entity;
- c. Information concerning the terms and conditions of any financing arrangement that involves the use of any public funds; or
- d. Information concerning the performance of any private entity developing or operating a qualifying transportation facility or a qualifying project.

However, to the extent that access to any procurement record or other document or information is compelled or protected by a court order, the City will comply with such order.

E. Use of Public Funds

Virginia constitutional and statutory requirements and City ordinances and policies as they apply to appropriation and expenditure of public funds apply to any interim or comprehensive agreement entered into under the PPEA. Accordingly, the processes and procedural requirements associated with the expenditure or obligation of public funds shall be incorporated into planning for any PPEA project or projects.

F. Applicability of Other Laws

Nothing in the PPEA shall affect the duty of the City to comply with all other applicable law not in conflict with the PPEA.

III. Solicited Proposals

The City may issue Request for Proposals (RFPs) or Invitations for Bids (IFBs), inviting proposals from private entities to develop or operate qualifying projects. The City may use a two-part proposal process consisting of an initial conceptual phase and a detailed phase. An RFP shall invite proposers to submit proposals on individual projects identified by the City. The City will set forth in the RFP the format and supporting information that is required to be submitted, consistent with the provisions of the PPEA. The City may establish suggested timelines for selecting proposals for the review and selection of solicited proposals.

The RFP will specify, but not necessarily be limited to, information and documents that must accompany each proposal and the factors that will be used in evaluating the submitted proposals. The RFP will also contain or incorporate by reference other applicable terms and conditions, including any unique capabilities or

qualifications that will be required of the private entities submitting proposals. Public notice of the RFP shall be posted in such public areas as are normally used for posting of the City's notices, including the City's website and published in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the City. In addition, solicited proposals shall be posted pursuant to Section IV. B. Pre-proposal conferences may be held as deemed appropriate by the City.

IV. Unsolicited Proposals

The PPEA permits the City to receive, evaluate and select for negotiations unsolicited proposals from private entities to develop or operate a qualifying project.

The City may publicize its needs and may encourage interested parties to submit proposals subject to the terms and conditions of the PPEA. When such a proposal is received without issuance of an RFP, the proposal shall be treated as an unsolicited proposal. The City may establish suggested timelines for the review and selection of unsolicited proposals.

A. Decision to Accept and Consider Unsolicited Proposal; Notice

1. Upon receipt of any unsolicited proposal or group of proposals and payment of the required fee or fees by the proposer or proposers, the City Council shall, after receiving the recommendation of the City Manager, determine whether to reject the unsolicited proposal or accept the unsolicited proposal for publication and further conceptual-stage consideration. If the proposal is or proposals are for an education facility, the City Manager shall consult with the Superintendent of Schools ("Superintendent"), who may receive the recommendation of the School Board regarding the proposal or proposals.
2. If City Council chooses to accept an unsolicited proposal for publication and conceptual-stage consideration, the City shall post a notice in a public area regularly used by the City for posting of public notices and on the City's website for a period of not less than 45 days. The City may also publish the same notice in one or more newspapers or periodicals of general circulation in the City to notify any parties that may be interested in submitting competing unsolicited proposals. Interested parties shall have adequate time as specified in the notice to submit competing unsolicited proposals. The notice shall state that the City (i) has received an unsolicited proposal under the PPEA, (ii) intends to evaluate the proposal, (iii) may negotiate an interim or comprehensive agreement with the proposer based on the proposal, and (iv) will receive for simultaneous consideration any competing proposals that comply with the guidelines adopted by the City and pursuant to the PPEA. The notice also shall summarize the proposed qualifying project or projects, and identify their proposed locations. If such unsolicited proposal is accepted and is to be evaluated using "competitive negotiation" procedures as described in Section IV. C. 1, the City shall make the written determination described in Section IV. C. 1 prior to such evaluation.

To ensure that sufficient information is available upon which to base the development of a serious competing proposal, representatives of the City familiar with the unsolicited proposal and the guidelines established by the City shall be made available to respond to inquiries and meet with private entities that are considering the submission of a competing proposal. The City shall conduct an analysis of the information pertaining to the proposal included in the notice to ensure that such information sufficiently encourages competing proposals. Further, the City shall establish criteria, including key decision points and approvals to ensure proper consideration of the extent of competition from available private entities prior to selection.

3. Any proposal not accepted for conceptual-stage consideration will be returned, together with all fees and accompanying documentation, to the proposer.

B. Posting Requirements

February 9, 2010

1. Conceptual proposals accepted for review and further evaluation, whether solicited or unsolicited, shall be posted by the City within 10 working days after acceptance of such proposals.

Posting shall be on the City's website or by publication, in a newspaper of general circulation in the area in which the contract is to be performed, of a summary of the proposals and the location where copies of the proposals are available for public inspection.

2. Nothing shall be construed to prohibit the posting of the conceptual proposals by additional means deemed appropriate by the City so as to provide maximum notice to the public of the opportunity to inspect the proposals.
3. In addition to the posting requirements, at least one copy of the proposals shall be made available for public inspection. Trade secrets, financial records, or other records of the private entity excluded from disclosure under the provisions Va. Code § 2.2-3705.6 (11) shall not be required to be posted, except as otherwise agreed to by the City and the private entity. Any inspection of procurement transaction records shall be subject to reasonable restrictions to ensure the security and integrity of the records.

C. Review at Conceptual Stage

1. When one or more proposals are received, the City will determine at this initial stage of review whether it will proceed with the evaluation of the proposals using standard procurement procedures consistent with the Virginia Public Procurement Act or procedures normally used by the City that are consistent with procurement of other than professional services through "competitive negotiation" as the term is defined in Va. Code § 2.2-4301. The City may proceed using such guidelines only if it makes a written determination that doing so is likely to be advantageous to the City and the public based upon either (i) the probable scope, complexity or priority of need; (ii) the risk sharing including guaranteed cost or completion guarantees, added value or debt, or equity investments proposed by the private entity; or (iii) the increase in funding, dedicated revenue or other economic benefit that would otherwise not be available. The City may reject any or all proposals.
2. After reviewing the original proposal and any competing proposals submitted during the notice period, the City may determine:
 - a. not to proceed further with any proposal;
 - b. to proceed to the detailed stage of review with the original proposal;
 - c. to proceed to the detailed stage with a competing proposal;
 - d. to proceed to the detailed stage with multiple proposals; or
 - e. to request modifications or amendments to any proposal.

In the event that more than one proposal will be considered in the detailed phase of review, the City shall consider whether the unsuccessful proposer should be reimbursed for costs incurred in the detailed phase of review, and such reasonable costs may be assessed to the successful proposer in the comprehensive agreement.

3. Discussions between the City and private entities about the need for infrastructure improvements shall not limit the ability of the City to later determine to use standard procurement procedures to meet its infrastructure needs. The City retains the right to reject any proposal at any time prior to the execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement.

V. Proposal Preparation and Submission

A. Format for Submissions at Conceptual Stage

At the conceptual stage, all proposals, whether solicited or unsolicited, shall contain information in the following areas: (i) qualifications and experience; (ii) project characteristics; (iii) project financing; (iv) project benefit and compatibility; and (v) any additional information that the City may request to comply with the requirements of the PPEA. Suggestions for formatting information to be included in proposals at this stage include the items listed below, as well as any additional information or documents that the City may request:

1. Qualifications and Experience

- a. Identify the legal structure or type of private entity making the proposal. Identify the organizational structure for the project, the management approach and how each partner and major subcontractor (\$1 million or more) in the structure fits into the overall team. All members of the operator/offeree's team, including major subcontractors known to the proposer, must be identified at the time a proposal is submitted for the conceptual stage. Identified team members, including major subcontractors (over \$1 million), may not be substituted or replaced once a project is approved and comprehensive agreement entered into, without the written approval of the City. Include the status of the Virginia license of each partner, proposer, contractor, and major subcontractor.
- b. Describe the experience of the private entity making the proposal and the key principals involved in the proposed project including experience with projects of comparable size and complexity, including prior experience bringing similar projects to completion on budget and in compliance with design, land use, service and other standards. Describe the length of time in business, business experience, public sector experience and other engagements of the private entity. Describe the past safety performance record and current safety capabilities of the private entity. Describe the past technical performance history on recent projects of comparable size and complexity, including disclosure of any legal claims by or against the private entity. Include the identity of any private entity that will provide design, construction and completion guarantees and warranties and a description of such guarantees and warranties.
- c. For each private entity or major subcontractor (\$1 million or more) that will be utilized in the project, provide a statement listing all of the private entity's prior projects and clients for the past five years and contact information for same (names/addresses/telephone numbers). If a private entity has worked on more than ten (10) projects during this period, it may limit its prior project list to ten (10), but shall first include all projects similar in scope and size to the proposed project and, second, it shall include as many of its most recent projects as possible. Each private entity or major subcontractor shall be required to submit all performance evaluation reports or other documents which are in its possession evaluating the private entity's performance during the preceding three years in terms of cost, quality, schedule maintenance, safety and other matters relevant to the successful project development, operation, and completion.
- d. Provide the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons within the private entity who may be contacted for further information.
- e. Provide a current or most recently audited financial statement of the private entity and each partner with an equity interest of ten percent or greater.

February 9, 2010

- f. Identify any persons known to the proposer who would be obligated to disqualify themselves from participation in any transaction arising from or in connection to the project pursuant to the Virginia State and Local Government Conflict of Interests Act, Chapter 31 (§ 2.2-3100 et seq.) of Title 2.2.
 - g. Identify the proposed plan for obtaining sufficient numbers of qualified workers in all trades or crafts required for the project.
 - h. For each private entity or major subcontractor that will perform construction or design activities, provide the following information:
 - (1) A sworn certification by an authorized representative of the private entity attesting to the fact that the private entity is not currently debarred or suspended by any federal, state or local government entity.
 - (2) A completed qualification statement that reviews all relevant information regarding technical qualifications and capabilities, private entity resources and business integrity of the private entity, including but not limited to, bonding capacities, insurance coverage and private entity equipment. This statement shall also include a mandatory disclosure by the private entity for the past five years any of the following conduct:
 - (A) bankruptcy filings
 - (B) liquidated damages
 - (C) fines, assessments or penalties
 - (D) judgments or awards in contract disputes
 - (E) contract defaults, contract terminations
 - (F) license revocations, suspensions, other disciplinary actions
 - (G) prior debarments or suspensions by a governmental entity
 - (H) denials of prequalification, findings of non-responsibility
 - (I) safety past performance data, including fatality incidents, "Experience Modification Rating," "Total Recordable Injury Rate" and "Total Lost Workday Incidence Rate"
 - (J) violations of any federal, state or local criminal or civil law
 - (K) criminal indictments or investigations
 - (L) claims filed by or against the firm
 - i. Worker Safety Programs: Describe worker safety training programs, job-site safety programs, accident prevention programs, written safety and health plans, including incident investigation and reporting procedures.
2. Project Characteristics
- a. Provide a description of the proposed project, including the conceptual design, in sufficient detail so that type and intent of the project, its location, and the communities that may be affected are clearly identified.
 - b. Identify and fully describe any work to be performed by the City.
 - c. Include a list of all federal, state and local permits and approvals required for the project and a schedule for obtaining such permits and approvals.
 - d. Identify any anticipated adverse social, economic and environmental impacts of the project. Specify the strategies or actions to mitigate known or anticipated impacts of the project. Indicate if any environmental or archaeological assessment has been completed.

February 9, 2010

- e. Identify the projected positive social, economic and environmental impacts of the project.
 - f. Identify the proposed schedule for the work on the project, including sufficient time for the City to review, and the estimated time for completion.
 - g. Identify contingency plans for addressing public needs in the event that all or some of the project is not completed according to projected schedule.
 - h. Propose allocation of risk and liability for work completed beyond the Comprehensive Agreement's completion date, and assurances for timely completion of the project.
 - i. State assumptions related to ownership, legal liability, law enforcement and operation of the project and the existence of any restrictions on the City's use of the project.
 - j. Provide information relative to phased or partial openings of the proposed project prior to completion of the entire work.
3. Project Financing
- a. Provide a preliminary estimate and estimating methodology of the cost of the work by phase, segment, or both.
 - b. Submit a plan for the development, financing and operation of the project showing the anticipated schedule on which funds will be required. Describe the anticipated costs of and proposed sources and uses for such funds, including any anticipated debt service costs. The operational plan shall include appropriate staffing levels and associated costs. Include any supporting due diligence studies, analyses or reports.
 - c. Include a list and discussion of assumptions underlying all major elements of the plan. Assumptions should include all significant fees associated with financing given the recommended financing approach. In addition, complete disclosure of interest rate assumptions should be included. Any ongoing operational fees, if applicable, should also be disclosed, as well as any assumptions with regard to increases in such fees.
 - d. Identify the proposed risk factors and methods for dealing with these factors.
 - e. Identify any local, state or federal resources that the proposer contemplates requesting for the project. Describe the total commitment, if any, expected from governmental sources and the timing of any anticipated commitment, both one-time and on-going. Such disclosure should include any direct or indirect guarantees or pledges of the City's credit or revenue.
 - f. Identify the amounts and the terms and conditions for any revenue sources.
 - g. Identify any aspect of the project that could disqualify the project from obtaining tax-exempt financing.
4. Project Benefit and Compatibility
- a. Identify community benefits, including the economic impact the project will have on the Commonwealth and the City in terms of amount of tax revenue to be generated for the Commonwealth and the City, the number of jobs generated for Virginia residents and level of pay and fringe benefits of such jobs, the training opportunities for apprenticeships and other training programs generated by the project, and the number and value of subcontracts generated for Virginia subcontractors.

February 9, 2010

- b. Identify any anticipated public support or opposition, as well as any anticipated government support or opposition, for the project.
- c. Explain the strategy and plan that will be carried out to involve and inform the general public, business community, local governments, and governmental agencies in areas affected by the project.
- d. Describe the compatibility of the project with local, regional, and state economic development efforts.
- e. Describe the compatibility with the City's comprehensive plan, infrastructure development plans, and capital improvements plan.

B. Format for Submissions at Detailed Stage

If the City decides to proceed to the detailed stage of review with one or more proposals, the following information must be provided by the proposer unless specifically waived in writing by the City:

- 1. A topographical map (1:2,000 or other appropriate scale) depicting the location of the proposed project.
- 2. Conceptual site plan indicating proposed location and configuration of the project on the proposed site.
- 3. Conceptual (single line) plans and elevations depicting the general scope, appearance and configuration of the proposed project.
- 4. Detailed description of the proposed participation of, use by, and financial involvement of the City.
- 5. A list of public utility facilities, if any, that will be crossed by the qualifying project and a statement of the plans of the proposer to accommodate such crossings.
- 6. A list of public facilities or other public improvements that will be required by the City to complete the project.
- 7. A statement and strategy setting out the plans for securing all necessary property interests required for the project. The statement must include the names and addresses, if known, of the current owners of the subject property interests, as well as a list of any property the proposer intends to request the City to condemn.
- 8. A detailed listing of all firms that will provide specific design, construction and completion guarantees and warranties, and a brief description of such guarantees and warranties.
- 9. A total life-cycle cost specifying methodology and assumptions of the project or projects and the proposed project start date. Include anticipated commitment of all parties; equity, debt, and other financing mechanisms; and a schedule of project revenues and project costs. The life-cycle cost analysis should include, but not be limited to, a detailed analysis of the projected return, rate of return, or both, expected useful life of facility and estimated annual operating expenses.
- 10. A detailed discussion of assumptions about user fees or rates, and usage of the projects.
- 11. Identification of any known government support or opposition, or general public support or opposition for the project. Government or public support should be demonstrated through resolutions of official bodies, minutes of meetings, letters, or other official communications.

February 9, 2010

12. Demonstration of consistency with appropriate City comprehensive or infrastructure development plans or indication of the steps required for acceptance into such plans.
13. Explanation of how the proposed project would affect the City's development plans.
14. Description of an ongoing performance evaluation system or database to track key performance criteria, including but not limited to, schedule, cash management, quality, worker safety, change orders, and legal compliance.
15. Identification of the executive management and the officers and directors of the firm or firms submitting the proposal. In addition, identification of any known conflicts of interest or other disabilities that may impact consideration of the proposal, including the identification of any persons known to the proposer who would be obligated to disqualify themselves from participation in any transaction arising from or in connection to the project pursuant to the Virginia State and Local Government Conflict of Interests Act, Chapter 31 (Va. Code § 2.2-3100 et seq.) of Title 2.2 of the Code of Virginia.
16. Additional material and information as the City may request.

VI. Proposal Evaluation and Selection Criteria

In reviewing any PPEA proposal accepted for consideration, the City shall engage the services of qualified professionals, which may include an architect, professional engineer, or certified public accountant, not otherwise employed by the City, to provide independent analysis regarding the specifics, advantages, disadvantages and the long- and short-term costs of any request by a private entity for approval of a qualifying project unless City Council determines that such analysis shall be performed by City employees.

The following items, along with the information that may be required under Sections V.A. and V.B. above, are some of the factors that the City may consider in the evaluation and selection of a PPEA proposal. The City reserves the right at all times to reject any proposal at any time for any reason.

A. Qualifications and Experience

Factors to be considered in either phase of the review to determine whether the proposer possesses the requisite qualifications and experience will include at a minimum:

1. Professional qualifications and experience with similar projects;
2. Demonstration of ability to perform the work;
3. Demonstrated record of successful past performance, including timeliness of project delivery, compliance with plans and specifications, quality of workmanship, cost-control and project safety;
4. Demonstrated conformance with applicable laws, codes, standards, regulations, and agreements on past projects;
5. Leadership structure;
6. Project manager's experience;
7. Management approach;
8. Project staffing plans, the skill levels of the proposed workforce, and the proposed safety plans for the project;

9. Financial condition of the proposer; and
10. Project ownership.

B. Project Characteristics

Factors to be considered in determining the project characteristics include, along with the specified information required under V.A. and V.B. above, the following:

1. Project definition;
2. Proposed project schedule;
3. Operation of the project;
4. Technology and technical feasibility;
5. Conformity to State and City laws, regulations, and standards;
6. Environmental impacts;
7. Condemnation impacts;
8. State and local permits; and
9. Maintenance of the project.

C. Project Financing

Factors considered in determining whether the proposed project financing allows adequate access to the necessary capital to finance the project include the following:

1. Cost and cost benefit to the City;
2. Financing, including debt source, and its impact on the debt or debt burden of the City;
3. Financial plan including overall feasibility and reliability of plan; default implications; the proposer's past performance with similar plans and similar projects; degree to which the proposer has conducted due diligence investigation and analysis of the proposed financial plan and the results of any such inquiries or studies;
4. Life-cycle cost analysis.
5. Opportunity costs assessment;
6. Estimated cost; and
7. The identity, credit history and past performance of any third party that will provide financing for the project, and the nature and timing of their commitment, as applicable.

In the event that any project is financed through the issuance of obligations that are deemed by the City to be tax-supported debt of the City, or if financing such a project may impact the City's debt rating or financial position, the City may select its own finance team, source, and financing vehicle.

D. Project Benefit and Compatibility

February 9, 2010

Factors considered in determining the proposed project's compatibility with the City's comprehensive or development plans include the following:

1. Community benefits, including the economic impact the project will have on the City in terms of amount of tax revenue generated for the City, the number of jobs generated for area residents, and level of pay and fringe benefits of such jobs, and the number and value of subcontracts generated for area subcontractors;
2. Community support or opposition, or both;
3. Public involvement strategy;
4. Compatibility with existing and planned facilities;
5. Compatibility with City, regional, and state economic development efforts; and
6. Compatibility with the City's land use and transportation plans.

E. Other Factors

Other factors that may be considered by the City in the evaluation and selection of PPEA proposals include:

1. The proposed cost of the qualifying project;
2. The general reputation, industry experience, and financial capacity of the private entity;
3. The proposed design of the qualifying project;
4. The eligibility of the project for accelerated documentation, review, and selection;
5. Local citizen and government comments;
6. Benefits to the public, including financial and nonfinancial;
7. The private entity's compliance with a minority business enterprise participation plan or good faith effort to comply with the goals of such plan;
8. The private entity's plans to employ local contractors and residents; and
9. The recommendation of a committee of representatives of the City which may be established to provide advisory oversight for the project.

VII. Interim and Comprehensive Agreements

Prior to developing or operating the qualifying project, the selected private entity shall enter into a comprehensive agreement with the City. Prior to entering a comprehensive agreement, an interim agreement may be entered into that permits a private entity to perform compensable activities related to the project. Any interim or comprehensive agreement shall define the rights and obligations of the City and the selected proposer with regard to the project.

A. Interim Agreement Terms

The scope of an interim agreement may include but is not limited to:

1. Project planning and development;

February 9, 2010

2. Design and engineering;
3. Environmental analysis and mitigation;
4. Survey;
5. Availability of financing for the proposed facility through financial and revenue analysis;
6. The process to negotiate, and the timing of the negotiation of, the comprehensive agreement; and
7. Any other provisions related to any aspect of the development or operation of a qualifying project that the parties may deem appropriate prior to the execution of a comprehensive agreement.

B. Comprehensive Agreement Terms

The scope of the comprehensive agreement shall include but not be limited to:

1. The delivery of maintenance, performance and payment bonds or letters of credit in connection with the development or operation of the qualifying project;
2. The review of plans and specifications for the qualifying project by the City;
3. The rights of the City to inspect the qualifying project to ensure compliance with the comprehensive agreement;
4. The maintenance of a policy or policies of liability insurance or self-insurance reasonably sufficient to insure coverage of the project and the tort liability to the public and employees and to enable the continued operation of the qualifying project;
5. The monitoring of the practices of the private entity by the City to ensure proper maintenance of the project;
6. The terms under which the private entity will reimburse the City for services provided;
7. The policy and procedures that will govern the rights and responsibilities of the City and the private entity in the event that the comprehensive agreement is terminated or there is a material default by the private entity including the conditions governing assumption of the duties and responsibilities of the private entity by the City and the transfer or purchase of property or other interests of the private entity by the City;
8. The terms under which the private entity will file appropriate financial statements on a periodic basis;
9. The mechanism by which user fees, lease payments, or service payments, if any, may be established from time to time upon agreement of the parties. Any payments or fees shall be set at a level that is the same for persons using the facility under like conditions and that will not materially discourage use of the qualifying project;
 - a. A copy of any service contract shall be filed with the City.
 - b. A schedule of the current user fees or lease payments shall be made available by the private entity to any member of the public upon request.

February 9, 2010

- c. Classifications according to reasonable categories for assessment of user fees may be made.
- 10. The terms and conditions under which the City may contribute financial resources, if any, for the qualifying project;
- 11. The terms and conditions under which existing site conditions will be assessed and addressed, including identification of the responsible party for conducting the assessment and taking necessary remedial action;
- 12. The terms and conditions under which the City will be required to pay money to the private entity and the amount of any such payments for the project;
- 13. Other requirements of the PPEA or other applicable law; and
- 14. Such other terms and conditions as the City may deem appropriate.

Any changes in the terms of the interim or comprehensive agreement as may be agreed upon by the parties from time to time shall be added to the interim or comprehensive agreement by written amendment.

The comprehensive agreement may provide for the development or operation of phases or segments of a qualifying project.

Parties submitting proposals understand that representations, information and data supplied in support of, or in connection with, proposals play a critical role in the competitive evaluation process and in the ultimate selection of a proposal by the City. Accordingly, as part of the interim or comprehensive agreement, the proposer and its team members shall certify that all material representations, information and data provided in support of, or in connection with, a proposal is true and correct. Such certifications shall be made by authorized individuals who have knowledge of the information provided in the proposal. In the event that material changes occur with respect to any representations, information or data provided for a proposal, the proposer shall immediately notify the City of same. Any violation of this section of the interim or comprehensive agreement shall give the City the right to terminate the agreement, withhold payment or other consideration due, and seek any other remedy available under the law.

C. Notice and Public Hearing Requirements

- 1. In addition to the posting requirements of Section IV. B, the City shall hold a public hearing on a proposal during the proposal review process, but not later than 30 days prior to entering into an interim or comprehensive agreement.
- 2. Once the negotiation phase for the development of an interim or a comprehensive agreement is complete and a decision to award has been made by the City, the City shall post the proposed agreement on the City's website or post a summary thereof by publication, in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.
- 3. In addition to the posting requirements, at least one copy of the proposals shall be made available for public inspection. Trade secrets, financial records, or other records of the private entity excluded from disclosure under the provisions of subdivision Va. Code § 2.2-3705.6 (11) shall not be required to be posted, except as otherwise agreed to by the City and the private entity.
- 4. Any studies and analyses considered by the City in its review of a proposal shall be disclosed to City Council at some point prior to the execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement.

5. Once an interim agreement or a comprehensive agreement has been entered into, the City shall make procurement records available for public inspection, upon request.
 - a. Such procurement records shall include documents protected from disclosure during the negotiation phase on the basis that the release of such documents would have had an adverse affect on the financial interest or bargaining position of the City or private entity in accordance with Section II.D.3.
 - b. Such procurement records shall not include (i) trade secrets of the private entity as defined in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (Va. Code § 59.1-336 et seq.); (ii) financial records, including balance sheets or financial statements of the private entity that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or otherwise; or (iii) cost estimates prepared by or for the City.

To the extent access to procurement records is compelled or protected by a court order, the City will comply with such order.
6. A copy of any comprehensive agreement shall be submitted by the City to the Auditor of Public Accounts within 30 days after execution.

VIII. Governing Provisions

In the event of any conflict between these guidelines and the requirements of the PPEA or other applicable law, the terms of the PPEA or other applicable law shall control.

Terms and Definitions

“Comprehensive agreement” means the comprehensive agreement between the private entity and the City that is required prior to the development or operation of a qualifying project.

“Conceptual stage” means the initial phase of project evaluation when the City makes a determination whether the proposed project serves a public purpose and meets the criteria for a qualifying project; assesses the qualifications and experience of a private entity proposer; reviews the project for financial feasibility; and determines whether the project warrants further pursuit.

“Cost-benefit analysis” means an analysis that weighs expected costs against expected benefits in order to choose the best option. For example, the City Manager may compare the costs and benefits of constructing a new office building to those of renovating and maintaining an existing structure in order to select the most financially advantageous option.

“Detailed stage” means the second phase of project evaluation where the public entity has completed the conceptual stage and accepted the proposal and may request additional information regarding a proposed project prior to entering into competitive negotiations with one or more private entities to develop an interim or comprehensive agreement.

“Develop” or **“Development”** means to plan, design, develop, finance, lease, acquire, install, construct, or expand.

“Interim agreement” means an agreement between a private entity and the City that provides for phasing of the development or operation, or both, of a qualifying project. Such phases may include, but are not limited to, design, planning, engineering, environmental analysis and mitigation, financial and revenue analysis, or any other phase of the project that constitutes activity on any part of the qualifying project.

“Lease payment” means any form of payment, including a land lease, by the City to the private entity for the use of a qualifying project.

February 9, 2010

“Lifecycle cost analysis” means an analysis that calculates cost of an asset over its entire life span and includes the cost of planning, constructing, operating, maintaining, replacing, and when applicable, salvaging the asset. Although one proposal may have a lower initial construction cost, it may not have the lowest lifecycle cost once maintenance, replacement, and salvage value is considered.

“Material default” means any default by the private entity in the performance of its duties that jeopardizes adequate service to the public from a qualifying project.

“Operate” means to finance, maintain, improve, equip, modify, repair, or operate.

“Opportunity cost” means the cost of passing up another choice when making a decision or the increase in costs due to delays in making a decision.

“Private entity” means any natural person, corporation, general partnership, limited liability company, limited partnership, joint venture, business trust, public benefit corporation, nonprofit entity, or other business entity.

“Public entity” means the Commonwealth and any agency or authority thereof, any county, city or town and any other political subdivision of the Commonwealth, any public body politic and corporate, or any regional entity that serves a public purpose.

“Qualifying project” means (i) any education facility, including, but not limited to a school building, any functionally related and subordinate facility and land to a school building (including any stadium or other facility primarily used for school events), and any depreciable property provided for use in a school facility that is operated as part of the public school system or as an institution of higher education; (ii) any building or facility that meets a public purpose and is developed or operated by or for any public entity; (iii) any improvements, together with equipment, necessary to enhance public safety and security of buildings to be principally used by a public entity; (iv) utility and telecommunications and other communications infrastructure; (v) a recreational facility; (vi) technology infrastructure, services, and applications, including, but not limited to, telecommunications, automated data processing, word processing and management information systems, and related information, equipment, goods and services; (vii) any services designed to increase the productivity or efficiency of the responsible public entity through the use of technology or other means; (viii) any technology, equipment, or infrastructure designed to deploy wireless broadband services to schools, businesses, or residential areas; (vix) any improvements necessary or desirable to any unimproved locally- or state-owned real estate; or (x) any solid waste management facility as defined in Code § 10.1-1400 that produces electric energy derived from solid waste.

“Responsible public entity” means a public entity that has the power to develop or operate the applicable qualifying project, including the City.

“Revenues” means all revenues, income, earnings, user fees, lease payments, or other service payments arising out of or in connection with supporting the development or operation of a qualifying project, including without limitation, money received as grants or otherwise from the United States of America, from any public entity, or from any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing in aid of such facility.

“Service contract” means a contract entered into between a public entity and the private entity pursuant to Va. Code § 56-575.5.

“Service payments” means payments to the private entity of a qualifying project pursuant to a service contract.

“State” means the Commonwealth of Virginia

“User fees” means the rates, fees, or other charges imposed by the private entity of a qualifying project for use of all or a portion of such qualifying project pursuant to the comprehensive agreement pursuant to Va. Code § 56-575.9.

February 9, 2010

PUBLIC HEARING - REQUEST TO VACATE A PORTION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY KNOWN AS BOSTON STREET LOCATED NEAR MARYVILLE AVENUE

The City of Hopewell received a request from Mr. James E. Adkins to vacate 0.023 acres of the undeveloped right-of-way identified as Boston Street located adjacent to Maryville Avenue for the purpose of consolidating the right-of-way with the adjoining lot to construct a single-family dwelling. The applicant currently owns the parcels located adjacent to the subject right-of-way. The applicant plans to utilize the portion of the vacated right-of-way to re-subdivide the adjacent parcel to construct a single-family dwelling. That portion of Boston Street is an undeveloped "paper street," and there are no records of any previous request to vacate the street. If the vacation of this portion of Boston Street is approved, the adjoining parcels will be consolidated forming Lot 20R, a 0.14 acre (6,348 square feet) parcel.

The public hearing was opened at 7:35 PM. There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed at 7:35 PM.

Motion was made by Councilor Harris, and seconded by Vice Mayor Cuffey, to approve an ordinance on first reading to vacate a portion of the right-of-way known as Boston Street located near Maryville Avenue. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

PUBLIC HEARING – TO CONSIDER A REQUEST TO VACATE A PORTION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY KNOWN AS DENDRON STREET BETWEEN OAKLAWN BOULEVARD AND WOODLAWN STREET

The City of Hopewell received a request from Aldridge & Southerland Builders, Inc. to vacate 8,300 square feet of the undeveloped right-of-way identified as Dendron Street located between Oaklawn Boulevard and Woodlawn Street for the purpose of consolidating the right-of-way with the adjoining lot to construct a retail business. Aldridge & Southerland Builders, Inc. have executed a purchase contract for 3701 and 3703 Oaklawn Boulevard and 3700 Woodlawn Street pursuant upon the approval of their right-of-way request. The applicant will consolidate the above-mentioned properties with a portion of the right-of-way to construct a 7,000 square foot retail business. If the vacation of this portion of Dendron Street is approved, the adjoining parcels will be consolidated forming a 3.45-acre parcel.

The public hearing was opened at 7:40 PM.

Justin Mullarkey, 226 Commerce St., Greenville, NC announced that it has been a pleasure to work with the City of Hopewell.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed at 7:42 PM.

Motion was made by Vice Mayor Cuffey, and seconded by Councilor Harris, to approve an ordinance on first reading to vacate a portion of the right-of-way known as Dendron Street Between Oaklawn Boulevard and Woodlawn Street. Upon the roll call the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes

February 9, 2010

Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

PUBLIC HEARING – TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XXII – G, FEES, OF THE CITY’S ZONING ORDINANCE

The proposed zoning ordinance amendment will remove the current Article XVIII – General Provisions in its entirety and replace it with the new Article XVIII – Development Standards. The new development standards section contains all of the requirements that apply to real estate development in the city. The requirements include, but are not limited to, parking and loading, signage, landscaping, buffering, fences, and architectural treatment.

The Planning Commission began the review of the development standards provisions in March 2008. The Commission conducted work sessions over the course of several months. Draft copies of the amendment have been reviewed by the City Attorney throughout the process. Revisions have been by the attorney and staff made changes to the amendment based on the attorney’s recommendations.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed zoning ordinance amendment at their July 2, 2009 meeting. After the public hearing and discussion of the proposed amendment, the Planning Commission unanimously agreed to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to City Council. City Council conducted a work session to discuss the proposed amendment on August 25, 2009. After a lengthy discussion of the proposed amendment, the Council determined to conduct a public hearing at their September 22, 2009 special meeting with the right of appeals language added to the proposed amendment.

The public hearing was opened at 7:45 PM. There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed at 7:45 PM.

Motion was made by Councilor Harris, and seconded by Councilor Walton, to approve an ordinance on first reading amending Article XVIII by removing – General Provisions in its entirety and replacing it with the new Article XVIII – Development Standards. The new development standards section contains all of the requirements that apply to real estate development in the city. The requirements include, but are not limited to, parking and loading, signage, landscaping, buffering, fences, and architectural treatment. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS

There being no speakers, Communications from Citizens was closed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – PROPOSED REINSTATEMENT OF THE CITY’S TAX ABATEMENT PROGRAM

City staff proposed an ordinance repealing Article XI, Tax Abatement for Rehabilitated/Renovated Structures, and enacting Article XI, Tax Abatement for Rehabilitated/Renovated or Replacement Structures, of Chapter 34, taxation, of the Code of the City of Hopewell, Virginia.

Motion was made by Councilor Stokes, and seconded by Councilor Bailey, to approve an ordinance on first reading repealing Article XI, Tax Abatement for Rehabilitated/Renovated Structures, and enacting Article

February 9, 2010

XI, Tax Abatement for Rehabilitated/Renovated or Replacement Structures, of Chapter 34, taxation, of the Code of the City of Hopewell, Virginia. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – REQUEST TO VACATE A PORTION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY KNOWN AS IVY STREET LOCATED BETWEEN WOODLAWN STREET AND COUSINS AVENUE

The City of Hopewell received a request from Arihant Management, LLC (Mr. Shah) to vacate 0.266 acres of the undeveloped right-of-way identified as Ivy Street located between Woodlawn Street and Western Street for the redevelopment of the adjoining property for commercial development. The applicant plans a commercial development consisting of office and retail space. Ivy Street is an undeveloped, “paper street,” and there are no records of any previous request to vacate the street. If the vacation of Ivy Street is approved, the adjoining parcels will be consolidated forming a 1.2-acre parcel and the site plan will be finalized for approval.

Motion was made by Councilor Walton, and seconded by Councilor Emerson, to approve and file the request to vacate undeveloped right-of-way identified as Ivy Street located between Woodlawn Street and Western Street, with the stipulation that a minimum of 10,000 s.f. of office or retail space must be built, within 24 months or it will revert back to the City; and there can be no apartments, no trailers, no tattoo parlors, and no dance clubs or bars. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

CITIZEN/COUNCILOR REQUEST – REQUEST BY KATHERINE PODLEWSKI FOR STATUS OF WATER MONITORING STATION ON CITY PARK PIER (FOLAR)

Katherine Podlewski reported that in 2008 City Council gave FOLAR \$12,000 for the construction of a pier and water monitoring station in Hopewell’s City Park. The pier was built, but there is no water monitoring station in City Park. She asked for the status of the project.

There was discussion about applying for a grant to do the monitoring. The State has \$14M in their Environmental Fund which came from Kepone fines in Hopewell. It would be desirable to use some of that money to assist Hopewell. Vice Mayor Cuffey reported that, as a teacher at Petersburg High School, he applied for (with the help of FOLAR and the DEQ) and received a \$10,000 grant for his class.

CITIZEN/COUNCILOR REQUEST – COUNCILOR HARRIS – REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES

Councilor Harris reported that he and Herbert Bragg, as members of the 2010 Legislative Committee, attended the meeting in Richmond with Hopewell’s legislators. Due to scheduling conflicts other members were unable to attend. Mr. Bragg gave a brief recap of the meeting. The legislators talked about the state budget, but there are needs at the local level also. A representative from Virginia First Cities also made a presentation at the meeting in Richmond. All were told to look forward to more budget cuts from the state. Hopewell’s legislative package equals \$10M.

February 9, 2010

Councilor Harris asked the City Attorney to research the 599 Funds. Mr. Lacheney reported that VML and other jurisdictions are considering litigation regarding this matter. He advised that Hopewell waits to see what the legislature does before we proceed with legal action.

REGULAR BUSINESS – BUILDING PERMIT FEES – CHIEF TUNSTALL, BUREAU OF FIRE – ORDINANCE

Contractors in the City of Hopewell and surrounding jurisdictions have voiced complaints about the cost of building permits in comparison to other localities. The Code Enforcement Department recommended charging by square footage of the building for residential structures rather than by cost of labor and materials. The changes will reduce the fee for building permits and increase the fees for electrical, mechanical and plumbing permits.

Motion was made by Councilor Stokes, and seconded by Councilor Harris to table this issue to the next meeting on March 9, 2010, and to direct staff to send out a notice to all contractors and builders who have a Hopewell Business License. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

REGULAR BUSINESS – VDOT – INSTALLING A THIRD EASTBOUND LANE ON ROUTE 36 OAKLAWN BOULEVARD and ROUTE 36 JEFFERSON PARK ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS INSTALLING FREE FLOW RIGHT TURN LANE – JOHNNIE BUTLER, CITY ENGINEER

In December 2008, VDOT, the regional MPO, and Fort Lee/BRAC traffic impact planners approved the requests to assign program funds to the described improvement project. The Jefferson Park Road Turn Lane improvements were conceptually approved by a past council action in March of 2000. VDOT requires a formal agreement to be ratified with all participating localities. This serves to acknowledge the understanding on the project design, involved utilities, and administration processes. The subject project has been expedited. A contract award is expected by June 30, 2010.

Standard Project Hearing, Design, Right-of-Way and Utility Agreement between Virginia Department of Transportation and the City. The agreement covers the State Route 36 design improvements, which are to add a third eastbound (inbound) lane by utilizing the existing right-of-way within the median zone. Action is to grant the City Manager, by resolution, the Authorization to Sign on behalf of the City.

The agreement covers the State Route 36 design improvements, which are to: 1) add a third eastbound (inbound) lane by utilizing the existing right-of-way within the median zone, and 2) installing a free flow right turn lane onto Jefferson park road from Route 36 Eastbound.

VDOT Project Number #0036-116-153 PE-101, R-201 C501 – UPC#90370 Third EBL Lane
VDOT Project Number #0036-116-105 PE-101, R201 C501 – UPC#19003 Right Turn Lane

Motion was made by Councilor Harris, and seconded by Councilor Stokes, to approve and authorize the City Manager to execute VDOT Project Agreement documents. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

February 9, 2010

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

REGULAR BUSINESS – RESOLUTION – JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE – ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROGRAM (ASAP)

In 1979, the City of Hopewell passed a resolution to participate in what is now called the John Tyler Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP). For the past 30 years it has been serving citizens in the Hopewell area. In an effort to adhere to the Commission on VASAP policies, they were asked to update the current resolution dated September 1979. In addition, the Commission on VASAP also requires that the locality appoint a member to the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board. Mr. Anthony Sylvester has been an active John Tyler ASAP Policy Board Member and would be willing to continue in that capacity and represent the City of Hopewell.

Motion was made by Councilor Emerson, and seconded by Councilor Harris, to adopt the John Tyler ASAP Resolution. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING THE CITY OF HOPEWELL ENDORSEMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT POLICY BOARD FOR THE JOHN TYLER ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROGRAM.

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Virginia, in the interest of highway safety, has enacted laws to create programs for probation, education, and rehabilitation of persons convicted of driving motor vehicles under the influence of alcoholic beverages and other self-administered drugs. These programs are known as Alcohol Safety Action Programs or ASAPs; and

WHEREAS, since 1979, the local program “John Tyler Alcohol Safety Action Program” has been serving the Cities of Colonial Heights, Emporia, Hopewell, Petersburg and the Counties of Chesterfield, Dinwiddie, Greensville, Henrico, Powhatan, Prince George, Surry and Sussex, providing probation, education, and rehabilitation of persons charged in violation of Virginia Code Section 18.2-266, and providing other services approved by the Commission on VASAP; and

WHEREAS, Sections 18.2-271 and 18.2-271.2 of the Code of Virginia require establishing a Commission on VASAP; said Commission to establish procedures for the operation of local ASAP program; and April 3, 1987, said Commission listed directives that all local ASAP programs would establish and implement an independent Policy Board, representative of localities served, to operate the program; and

WHEREAS, by resolution previously adopted by this Council on September 11, 1979, the City of Hopewell became part of the John Tyler Alcohol Safety Action Program pursuant to Section 15.2-1300 of the Virginia Code.

February 9, 2010

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, the City of Hopewell hereby reaffirms its position as a participating locality in the John Tyler Alcohol Safety Action Program, herein called the Program, endorses the continuation of an independent Policy Board, and agrees to the following:

1. The Policy Board consists of at least seven (7) but not more than fifteen (15) members.
2. Each city and county governing body shall appoint one (1) *member* to serve as a representative to the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board for a term of three (3) years; and additional Policy Board members shall be elected according to the Policy Board's by-laws. Membership not appointed by the governing bodies of represented jurisdictions at the discretion of the Board, shall be selected or elected from but not limited to the judiciary, the bar, law enforcement, education, treatment professionals and other interested groups such as local transportation safety commissions. Vacancies which occur on Board shall be filled by majority vote of the remaining board Members from nomination of other Board Members and participating bodies of the jurisdiction.
3. A Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary shall be elected in accordance with the by-laws. The Program's Executive Director shall serve an ex-officio member without voting power.
4. The Policy Board shall hire and supervise the Program's Executive Director. The Executive Director shall be responsible to implement operational policies for the Program, hire and supervise staff for the Program and control all revenues and expenditures. The Executive Director shall serve at the pleasure of the Policy Board.
5. The program shall be operated by the Board in compliance with the VASAP Commission Policies and Procedures and in conjunction with requirements of the local administrative and fiscal agency.
6. Each fiscal year, the Executive Director shall prepare a budget and submit it for approval to the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board the Commission on VASAP. The VASAP Commission shall be responsible for funding any deficit occurring in the operation of John Tyler ASAP.
7. An annual report shall be prepared under the supervision of the Policy Board indicating the activities of John Tyler ASAP.
8. This agreement shall remain in effect continuously from year to year until termination either by the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board, local jurisdiction, or the Commission on VASAP. Participating cities or counties may withdraw at any time by official action of its governing body and appropriate notice to the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board. If a locality withdraws, its representatives shall no longer serve on the John Tyler ASAP Policy Board.
9. The Program may acquire and own real property and personal property as approved by the Policy Board for the Program's operation. Title to such property shall be vested in the Program. Should the Program cease to operate, all property shall be disposed of pursuant to applicable provisions of the Virginia Code. The Policy Board may seek the advice of the Commission on VASAP and the Attorney General. It is the intent of this resolution that the Program's assets, upon either partial or complete dissolution of the Program, shall be divided amongst the participating localities at the time of dissolution in the same proportion as the clients served from that locality.

REPORT OF THE CITY CLERK - REGULAR BUSINESS - APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Motion was made by Councilor Emerson, and seconded by Councilor Harris, to appoint Libbie Newsome to the Historic Preservation Committee; to appoint Rick Newman, Commonwealth's Attorney to the: Law Library Committee, Riverside Community Corrections Board, Technology Fund Committee, and JTCC-ASAP; and to appoint Philip Quinn to the Richmond CAP.

February 9, 2010

Motion to amend was made by Councilor Walton, and accepted by Councilor Emerson and Councilor Harris, to table the appointment to the JTCC-ASAP at this time.

Upon the roll call to appoint Libbie Newsome to the Historic Preservation Committee; to appoint Rick Newman, Commonwealth's Attorney to the: Law Library Committee, Riverside Community Corrections Board, and Technology Fund Committee; and to appoint Philip Quinn to the Richmond CAP, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Councilor Bailey attended her first Virginia First Cities meeting. They talked about state level job creation, etc. Innovation is very important at this time.

Vice Mayor Cuffey reported as Liaison to the Hopewell/Prince George Chamber of Commerce. They are building industry and community. They discussed an upcoming trip to Capitol Hill.

REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Councilor Bailey reported on the January 25, 2010 meeting at which Joe Jones of the Archaeological Center at the College of William and Mary addressed the public. The study approved by Council enables the committee to look at grants and neighborhood improvement activities. Councilor Bailey announced that a Ward #1 meeting is being planned. She mentioned the Clean Sweep effort within the city; neighborhood networking; focusing on being positive; and, keeping citizens involved through better communication.

Councilor Harris recognized February as Black History Month and the many activities being held. He encouraged all citizens to participate in these activities. He urged citizens to pay attention to improvement to, and encourage black and white interaction.

Councilor Walton was disappointed that the Scenic River designation will not happen this year due to some Chesterfield land owners who were against it. There was overwhelming support of the bill but they will have to try again in this year's General Assembly. The United Way Fund is up to 87% at over \$300,000.

Councilor Stokes reported on the ceremony held last month for the Algae project at HRWTF. As a member of the School Construction Committee, he attended another meeting. There was discussion of combining the City and School Board health insurance to save money. We need to start working toward a long term goal for the city. He commended City Council for their business-like behavior and for keeping the meeting within the three-hour time limit.

Councilor Emerson agreed with Councilor Stokes' comments. He also wanted to express his thanks to the Public Works Department for their diligence with snow removal after the last few snow storms. Councilor Emerson received many phone calls regarding problems with deer, primarily in the Mansion Hills area. Perhaps a work session should be planned with the state to discuss the issue in trying to control the deer population. There is concern about the danger of deer ticks. The City Manager indicated that Mark Haley will contact the Game Warden for a census count of the deer. Councilor Emerson met with the mayor at the Library for Walk Against Crime. He was impressed with the number of people who attended. The next meeting is on February 27, 2010 at 1:00 PM at the Library. A Walk Against Crime is being planned for May 1, with a rain date of May 8.

February 9, 2010

Vice Mayor Cuffey complimented the Police Department on Community Policing; they are doing an outstanding job. He also commended the City Manager and the Public Works Department for snow removal, and addressing the issue of potholes throughout the city. Finally, he attended Judge Kenneth Nye's retirement last week and wished him well.

Mayor Pelham announced the February Calendar: 11th – VML Day at the Richmond Marriott; CPDC meeting; 12th – 4:00 PM Human Services Building Ground Breaking; 13th – First Christian Church Community Prayer Vigil & Spaghetti Dinner; Black History Program; 15th – George Washington Day – Employee Holiday; Hopewell Schools open; 16th – Mallonee Lofts open House 4:00-6:00 PM; 18th – National Prayer Breakfast 6:30 AM at Ft. Lee; 19th – DuPont – Black History Dinner 6:00 PM; 26th – SRMC Fellowship Program 7:00 AM; and 27th – 2:00 PM Banquet Zion Hill Temple. In addition Herbert Bragg has coordinated for the Black Heritage Committee a guest speaker, Senator Henry Marsh. The program will honor a local hero, Claiborne "Dickie" Gholson, Negro Baseball League coach. March 11 is the Shout from the Top program at JRMC. On February 13 the Mayor has an Education-Financial workshop at HHS from 10:00 – 2:00 PM. Many colleges will be represented and a work shop for high school seniors. In March, 38 officers from Ft. Lee will be volunteering to work on some city residences through ElderHomes. They will need to have lunch delivered to the work sites and the Mayor asked if any civic groups or church groups would be able to assist. A number of City employees volunteered to assist the elderly and disabled throughout Hopewell in recognition of Martin Luther King Day. Finally, she was given a Sesquicentennial DVD which she will give to the City Manager after viewing it.

ADJOURN

At 8:55 PM **motion** was made by Vice Mayor Cuffey, and seconded by Councilor Walton to adjourn the meeting. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Vice Mayor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes
Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Stokes	-	yes
Councilor Walton	-	yes
Mayor Pelham	-	yes

Brenda S. Pelham
Mayor

Ann M. Romano, City Clerk